DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 430 JC 680 283

By-Roueche, John E.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
Pub Date Jun 68
Note-4p.
Journal Cit-Junior College Research Review; v2 n10 June 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.24
Descriptors-ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, ADMINISTRATOR BACKGROUND, *ADMINISTRATOR CHARACTERISTICS, ADMINISTRATOR QUALIFICATIONS, *ADMINISTRATOR SELECTION, CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *PRESIDENTS, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

With new junior colleges opening at the rate of more than one per week and the estimated demand for new chief administrators subsequently reaching 100 annually (between 1965 and 1980), a shortage of qualified personnel to serve in top administrative positions has become evident. Most presidents are selected from within their respective states, 52.8% have master's degrees, 44.1% have doctorates, and junior college presidents generally are 50 to 53 years of age. Slightly more than half (50.4%) of the presidents come from the junior college field, and of this number all but 1% come from the public junior college. Others are drawn from 4-year colleges and universities (15.9%). Increasingly, junior college presidents are being drawn from fields other than higher education. At the level of their highest degrees, most presidents specialized in some area of professional education other than higher education while 8.4% majored in higher education (including junior college administration). Today's junior college president, in addition to being somewhat older than was his predecessor of previous decades, has attained a higher degree of education, has acquired more administrative experience in higher education, and has had more junior college experience. (DG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

Volume 2, Number 10

UCLA JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

June, 1968

A periodical review of research reports received and processed at the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
Published by the American Association of Junior Colleges

ED 022430
JC 680 283

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

New junior colleges are opening at the rate of more than one per week. One hundred and thirty community colleges were organized in the three-year period 1963-1966, and more than two hundred new ones will be opened in the next three to four years. National projections indicate there will be more than one thousand public junior colleges in operation within ten years (JC 680 074). The most spectacular development has been in public institutions, but private junior colleges have also expanded their role in higher education (JC 660 041).

One of the most important factors in determining whether American junior colleges will measure up to the expectations held for them is the quality of their administrative leadership. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation recognized that concern in 1960 and extended grants to ten major universities for the establishment of special graduate programs to prepare men and women for junior college administrative positions. Even with such substantial assistance from the Foundation, there continues to be a shortage of qualified personnel to fill the rapidly multiplying number of chief administrative positions in junior colleges.

This issue of *Junior College Research Review* examines research on the junior college president. The documents reviewed were selected from materials received and processed at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. All of the materials reviewed here have been announced and abstracted in the official ERIC publication, *Research in Education.*

Review

The junior college president is the key to innovation (JC 680 081). A national survey of the chief administrative officers in 233 public junior colleges in the United States found that the personal attitude of the chief administrative officer toward experimental (innovative) programs was the most significant single factor in the process of adoption or rejection of such programs. The questionnaire included in the study provided data on the following staff utilization programs, defined by the author as "innovative": (1) team teaching; (2) class size variations; (3) teacher aides; (4) language laboratories; and (5) television instruction. In each of the first four programs a higher correlation was noted between nonadoption and the attitude of the chief administrator than between nonadoption and some situational concern, such as lack of funds, shortage of staff, or lack of space. In one case, for example, failure to introduce televised instruction resulted from lack of funds, not from weak administrative support.

The mean age of the chief administrators of public junior colleges is 50.3 years (JC 680 062). In his nationwide study of public junior college chief administrators, Roberts found that 96 percent of the chief administrators had earned graduate degrees. Of the total group 52.8 percent had master's degrees and 44.1 percent had earned doctorates. Of the chief administrators who had doctorates, 64.6 percent had the Ed.D. while 35.4 percent had the Ph.D.

Of the 333 chief administrators surveyed, 50.4 percent came to their junior college positions from within the junior college field; in fact, all but .9 percent from *public* junior colleges. Another 15.9 percent came to their positions from four-year colleges and universities. A total of 66.3 percent of the chief administrators arrived from institutions of higher education.

The primary sources of the chief administrators investigated in the study were: (1) public junior colleges, (2) public and private secondary schools, and (3) public and private four-year colleges and universities. Chief administrators from those sources comprised 91.9 percent of the total group surveyed.

In the investigation, 63.7 percent of the chief administrators reported that the field of specialization of their highest degree was in some area of professional education other than higher education. Higher education, including junior college administration, was reported as a major field by 8.4 percent of the chief administrators.

Roberts found that, in some states, there was pronounced provincialism in the selection of chief

administrators. In California, for example, 73.8 percent of the chief administrators came to their positions from public junior colleges within the State — 36.1 percent of them from within their own institutions. Of the other sixteen states investigated, only Mississippi (69.2 percent), Kansas (61.6 percent), and Texas (58.6 percent) selected more than half of their public junior college chief administrators from within their own junior college system; other states draw from other sources. In Iowa, for example, 85.7 percent of the reporting chief administrators came directly from elementary or secondary school positions. The percentage of those coming directly from positions in four-year colleges or universities was greatest in Maryland (41.7 percent) and Florida (29.4 percent). Assuming that an earned doctorate and previous administrative experience in a junior college or four-year college are the two measurable background characteristics most desirable in a chief administrator, the men with these qualifications are most likely to be found in large institutions in California, Florida, Maryland, New York, and Washington (JC 680 062).

A study conducted by Johnston used questionnaire returns from administrators in 167 private junior colleges to project national needs for private junior college administrators (JC 660 067). For the period 1963-1975, 1,077 key administrative vacancies (including 352 for presidents) were predicted. At the time of the study, more than half of the administrators of private junior colleges were over 53 years of age; fewer than 22 percent had doctoral degrees, 61 percent had master's degrees, and almost 26 percent had no graduate degrees. Turnover in independent colleges was less frequent than in church-related institutions, and chief administrators who changed colleges tended to remain in the same geographical area. Johnston concluded that the educational background of private junior college administrators was lower than should be expected and that private colleges faced great difficulty in competing with other public institutions, business, and industry for high-level administrators.

Finding qualified chief administrators during the next decade will pose problems for both existing and new junior colleges. In a 1965 nationwide study of junior college administrative needs, Schultz predicted that 1,403 new presidents will be needed by the nation's junior colleges, both public and private, during the period 1965-1966 through 1979-1980 — an average of almost one hundred new presidents each year (JC 660 041). The investigator found that a "new breed" of junior college presidents was beginning to emerge. Those assuming the role of president in 1964-1965 differed from their predecessors in several ways: (1) They possessed a higher degree of educational attainment; (2) More of the newly appointed presidents had administrative experience in higher education; (3) More of them had junior college experience; (4) They were slightly older at the time of their appointment than their predecessors had been. Schultz strongly recommended the establishment of in-service training programs to assist and upgrade administrators in the junior college field.

In a nationwide survey, Luskin (JC 680 074) explored the views of junior college presidents who came from backgrounds other than the junior college (i.e., such cognate fields as higher education, secondary or elementary administration, business and industry, governmental service, and graduate school) and examined those views to determine the feasibility of offering a workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles, in the summer of 1968 for such presidents. Luskin identified "human relations" (i.e., relations with faculty, administrators, etc.) as the problem or issue that proved most difficult for 48.5 percent of the newly appointed presidents. "Business operations and finance" was identified as a major problem by 15.4 percent of the respondents. The problems most difficult for the wives of newly appointed junior college presidents were identified by Luskin as follows: (1) starting some type of faculty association; (2) understanding protocol; (3) human relations; and (4) too little time to be a wife (JC 680 074).

Summary

It appears that the president is the key to change in the junior college. Because he is more influential than any other person, it is almost axiomatic that "if the president wants something to happen, it will." The president is the educational leader of the junior college and the relative success of any program can often be traced directly to the president's interest in it. The fact that the president, more than anyone else, is the "change agent" in the junior college is well documented. Ultimately, he is responsible for all aspects of his institution.

While there has been much discussion about the relative "youth" of junior college presidents, available research indicates that chief administrative officers of the 1960's are actually older than were their predecessors of previous decades. Junior college presidents are better educated and better prepared than ever before, with more years of actual experience in higher education prior to their appointment.

With the tremendously increasing numbers of new two-year colleges, boards of trustees will be hard pressed to find experienced junior college chief administrators. The Luskin study (JC 680 074) indicated that increasing numbers of junior college presidents are coming to their positions from areas outside higher education. Such individuals need every opportunity to learn about the philosophy and programs of the junior college. Workshops for newly appointed presidents appear to be a most feasible way to meet this in-service requirement. While few today would agree that the "junior college is merely the lengthened shadow of its president," available research indicates that he may be the key to instructional quality in any junior college.

John E. Roueche

BIBLIOGRAPHY

JC 660 041 (ED 011 757)

Administrators for America's Junior Colleges; Predictions of Need 1965-1980, by Raymond E. Schultz. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. 1965. 29 pp.

JC 660 067 (ED 013 597)

Private Junior College Administrators: An Analysis of Their Backgrounds and a Twelve-Year Prediction of Future Needs, by Archie Breckenridge Johnston. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. 1965. 256 pp.

JC 660 445

Presidents' Reports in American Junior Colleges, by Frederick C. Kintzer. University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program. 1963. 66 pp.

JC 670 219

"The Changing Profile of the Junior College President," by Raymond E. Schultz in *Junior College Journal*, 36 (2): 8-12; October 1965.

JC 670 378 (ED 011 774)

Presidents of Public Junior Colleges—An Analysis of Selected Background Factors, by Raymond E. Schultz and Dayton Y. Roberts. Florida State University, Department of Higher Education, Tallahassee, Florida. 1964. 31 pp.

JC 670 804 (ED 013 623)

Leadership Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President. Report from the Southeast Regional Junior College Leadership Program. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. 1965. 63 pp.

JC 680 062

Chief Administrators of Public Junior Colleges—A Prediction of the Number Needed and the Sources of Supply, 1963-1973, by Dayton Young Roberts. Dissertation. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. 1964. 94 pp.

JC 680 074

A Workshop of Interest to New Presidents with Little Background in the Junior College—An Analysis, by Bernard J. Luskin. Seminar Paper. University of California, Los Angeles, School of Education. 1967. 44 pp.

JC 680 081

"The President: A Key to Innovation," by William K. Ramstad, in *Junior College Journal*, 37: 30-31; October 1966.

JC 680 120

"Selecting a College President," by Bill J. Priest, in *Junior College Journal*, 35: 5-7; April 1965.

JC 680 121

The Junior College President's Job: An Analysis of Perceived Job Performance and Possible Influencing Variables, by Robert Gene Graham. Dissertation. University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1965. 160 pp.

JC 680 122

The Community College President: A Study of the Role of President of the Public Community Junior College. Dissertation. Columbia University, New York. 1962. 207 pp.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

Arthur M. Cohen, *Principal Investigator and Director*

John E. Roueche, *Associate Director*

Lorraine Mathies, *Co-Investigator*

Advisory Board

LLOYD MESSERSMITH
Executive Secretary
California Junior College Association

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

ROBERT M. HAYES
Professor, School of Library Service, UCLA
Director, Institute of Library Research

B. LAMAR JOHNSON
Professor of Higher Education, UCLA

RICHARD KOSAKI
Chairman, Council of State Directors
of Community Junior Colleges

THOMAS B. MERSON
Dean of Instruction
Bakersfield Junior College

C. ROBERT PACE
Professor of Higher Education, UCLA

ROBERT VOSPER
University Librarian, UCLA

JAMES L. WATTENBARGER
Director, Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW
Arthur M. Cohen, Editor
Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
Room 96, Powell Library
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
PERMIT NO. 12378

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 12 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

2/10